

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 4-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

The Examiner asserts that the term “JIS code 2223” is unclear.

“JIS code 2223” refers a Japanese Industrial Standard and is a code corresponding to the character “■” (a black square). This code appears in a list of JIS X0208 Kanji Codes for Information Exchange.

Applicants enclose a copy of this list as well as an English translation of this list. See the third page of the list and page 5 of the translation for JIS code 2223. The list is described in many websites. *See, e.g.,* <http://koba.jp/network/mail/JIS-X-0208.html>. The list at the above website is the same as the enclosed list. A copy of the printout from this website is attached. *See* page 5 of the printout for JIS code 2223.

II. Double Patenting

The Examiner has issued three (3) nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections as follows:

claims 1-16 have been rejected on the ground on nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,048,790 to Taguchi *et al.*;

claims 1-16 have been rejected on the ground on nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 7,029,523 to Taguchi *et al.*;
and

claims 1-6, 8-11, and 17-18 have been rejected on the ground on nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 14-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7,037,365 to Taguchi *et al.*

Rejections based on obviousness-type double patenting can be avoided by filing terminal disclaimers. The filing of a terminal disclaimer to obviate a rejection based on obviousness-type double patenting is not an admission of the propriety of the rejection, and raises neither a presumption nor estoppel on the merits of the rejection (see, MPEP § 804.02).

Applicants have filed herewith three terminal disclaimers, labeled A, B, and C. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw these double patenting rejections.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 9, 2007


Ken Sakurabayashi
Registration No. 58,490